

Sir from CMC's office...

IRT SN's RFI - The cost per month for maintaining 500-1000 Marines on the border is about \$2.5M. This amount is arrived at by the total cost per year (\$21M) minus the amount already expended (\$6M) divided by the remaining (6) months in the Fiscal Year.

EmilyGrace Mate

Chief of Staff

Office of the Secretary of the Navy

Office: (b) (6)

Mobile: (b) (6)

Email: (b) (6)



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(ENERGY, INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20305-1000

ACTION MEMO

APR 05 2019

UNSECNAV _____

FOR: SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

FROM: Todd C. Mellon, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy (EI&E)

(b) (6) 4/4/19

SUBJECT: Military Construction Necessary to Support the Use of the Armed Forces in
Connection with the National Emergency at the Southern Border

- Mr. Secretary, request you sign the Policy Coordination Sheet (TAB A) concurring with Assistant Secretary of Defense, Homeland Defense & Global Security ((ASD (HD&GS)) Action Memo and package to the Acting Secretary of Defense (A/SD) (TABS A-E).
- In response to A/SD request, on March 20, 2019 the Secretary of Homeland Security submitted a prioritized list of proposed border construction projects to aid in securing the southern border.
- To help inform A/SD decision to exercise the authority provided by 10 U.S.C. § 2808 (Construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency), ASD (HD&GS) drafted two memorandums tasking Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer (USD(C)/CFO) to make an assessment of the submitted project list by May 10, 2019.
- The first memorandum requests the CJCS to provide his best military advice as to whether the proposed border construction projects could support the use of the Armed Forces in addressing the national emergency at the southern border. The second memorandum requests the USD(C)/CFO to identify sufficient military construction projects as potential funding sources for construction projects to secure the southern border.
- USD(C)/CFO is directed to consult with the Secretaries of the Military Departments as necessary to review the unawarded project pool to minimize effects on readiness. Military housing, barracks, and dormitory projects; projects that have already been awarded; and projects that have FY19 award dates are not to be considered as possible funding sources.

RECOMMENDATION: SECNAV sign TAB A

COORDINATION: TAB F

Attachments:

As stated

Prepared By: (b) (6) OASN EI&E (b) (6)

UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

EmilyGrace Mate
Chief of Staff
Office of the Secretary of the Navy
Office: (b)(6)
Mobile: (b)(6)
Email: (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Crites, Randy B RADM ASN(FM&C), FMB , N82 (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 3:46 PM
To: Mate, EmilyGrace SES SECNAV, FO (b)(6)
Cc: Harker, Thomas HON ASN (FM&C) (b)(6) Marshall, Joe B
SES ASN (FM&C), ASN (FM&C) (b)(6) Tompa, Mary K SES
ASSTSECNAV FMC WASHINGTON DC, OASN (FMB) (b)(6) Carns,
Barbara B SES OASN FM&C, FMB (b)(6) (b)(6)

Subject: FY 2019 Unfunded Requirements

EmilyGrace,

You asked for an update of our FY 2019 shortfalls/unfunded requirements that may result in above threshold reprogramming (ATR). I've attached a summary slide of our major FY19 shortfalls that we are currently tracking, does not include the 53K/SM6 ATR that already went forward to OSD. As you can see on the chart our shortfalls include hurricane damage, other USMC must funds and ship depot maintenance which we are including on our February ATR to OSD which is attached as a word document (draft). The remaining FY19 shortfalls include military personnel (MILPERS), comprehensive review (CR/SRR), ERP, NCIS, civilian pay raise, fuel and other items that you can see on the slide - all need further analysis. I cannot say today if these will require a future ATR to fix. I believe some of them will, but until we get further into the fiscal year and we complete our midyear review, I won't know. I'm fairly confident that at a minimum we will need an ATR to address a manpower and fuel, probably in the May timeframe.

I've provided some additional info below the cutline for SA.

VR Randy

BLUF: While the full scope of our FY19 unfunded requirements could reach \$5B, there are a few critical bills that need to be addressed now via ATR and would be part of OSD's General Transfer Authority (GTA). These are primarily Marine Corps facilities damaged by hurricanes, additional ship depot maintenance requirements, and Navy MILPERS overburn. We do not currently have sufficient acceptable sources to address these shortfalls and would need help from OSD to source. The remainder of our unfundeds can be handled within DON during Midyear review as candidates for internal reprogrammings (should smaller sources become available) or for inclusion on the May 2019 Omnibus ATR.

- For the Marines we will try to resource \$1.4B in hurricane projects in FY19 and another \$200M in critical unfundeds (including Southwest border security, Exercise Trident Juncture, and unit- and individual-training

enhancements). However, we have only identified \$450M in sources for this package, consisting of a many smaller USMC procurement items. Absent a supplemental appropriation from the Hill for hurricane damages, we will need OSD to provide other DoD sources or direct that we reduce the hurricane repairs.

- Navy has submitted a package to make an initial \$471M down-payment on ship maintenance bills. The Fleets estimate that they have ~\$1B in unfundeds for this program, but the ATR would at least resource must-fund bills for surface ship maintenance resulting from fact of life increases for two private-sector submarine avails and repairs to fire damage on the USS OSCAR AUSTIN. The source of funding within this package are investment assets, but the majority is a \$350M Congressional add for an LHA(R) which may generate pushback.

- Two other major issues that are likely candidates for an ATR in May are MILPERS overexecution (overburn) and fuel rate increases. First, Navy is deliberately overexecuting in Navy MILPERS accession in FY19. FY18 overburn resulted in an \$85M bill and, if we allow BUPERS to continue on their current pace, would add another \$85M for FY19 overburn. We need to address at least the FY18 component and then decide in the near future whether BUPERS should continue their trend. A key factor in this decision will be whether OSD is willing to reprogram MILPERS assets from other services. Second, there may be a shortfall in our readiness accounts of ~\$285M as OSD raised the fuel rate to cover Defense Working Capital Fund (DWCF) losses. We need some time to see if the Fleets have operational underexecution assets that could be reapplied to absorb this cost growth. We will re-assess this during our Midyear review in March.

Besides what I've discussed above, we are tracking another \$1.3B in bills for the Navy and \$175M for the Marine Corps that need further review. We will continue working with the BSOs to refine the requirements and provide an assessment and recommendation after the midyear review. Key issues in this category include comprehensive Review (CR), ERP upgrades, NCIS, and shipyard optimization. Finally we are keeping an eye on several areas that still might spin out bills. Most significant are a possible civilian pay raise and WCF impacts from fuel pricing and workload losses.

Mr. Secretary,
FYI.

As per yesterday again, (b)(5) ...think we are done
and moving forward.... look fwd to hearing about today's meet.
Thanks for the visit and the "medicine" yesterday.
V/R Neller

-----Original Message-----

From: Uribe BGen Rick A

Sent: Sunday, January 6, 2019 11:58 PM

To: Dana LtGen Michael G(b)(6)

Beaudreault LtGen Brian D

(b)(6)

Craparotta LtGen Lewis A

(b)(6)

Osterman LtGen Joseph L

(b)(6)

Cc: Neller Gen Robert B(b)(6)

Thomas Gen Gary L

(b)(6)

; Chiarotti LtGen Charles G

(b)(6)

; Pratt MajGen Helen G

; Cooling BGen Norman L

; Iszewski BGen Stephen E

; James MajGen Bradley S

(b)(6)

Habel SES Gregg T (b)(6)

Sofge

BGen Robert B JR (b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Subject: JFLCC UPDATE

Gentlemen,

I apologize for the length of this e-mail, will be more pithy in future reports.

The JFLCC continues operations in support of CBP border mission priorities (consistent with RFAs #1-3) in CA and AZ through 31 Jan 19. The units remain prepared to conduct active protection of Federal personnel or partial to full closure at priority POEs (San Ysidro, Otay Mesa, Calexico, and Nogales) with units continuing to conduct combined civil disturbance training/rehearsals with CBP partners and POE barrier hardening efforts. In CA, we have been asked to support CBP in the medical evaluation of migrants. This commenced yesterday and will be executed within the authorities of RFA 2 & 3 and will conclude when processing numbers return to steady state or at the end of RFA # 3. During the last 24-hours the SPMAGTF-7 medical team evaluated 10 non-caravan migrants with flu like symptoms, muscle soreness, and minor cuts - all treated and returned to CBP for continued processing. The JFLCC's Main Effort remains with the SPMAGTF-7 in CA.

Personnel numbers remained steady at: 2,349 personnel in the JOA. 603 in TX, 650 in the AZ corridor, and 1,096 in the CA corridor.

While the recent gathering of approximately 150 migrants at the U.S. border in Tijuana on 1 Jan 19 and the response by CBP received media coverage, it is important to note that there was no request for DoD assistance, none was required, as the CPB considered it a non-event. Today, there were two demonstrations along the southwest border, both were peaceful, and did not disrupt border operations. With that said, the calm on the SW border continued...there are currently no indications the migrants intend to rush the border or conduct any violent actions to cross the US border. According to Mexican Federal Police and Mexico National Institute of Migration, there are approximately 2100 migrants remaining in Baja California with ~1750 in Tijuana, and ~350 in Mexicali. There were only 15 migrants reported crossing in the last 24-hrs in the CA region, however there were more

illegal crossing from other nations. Migrant numbers will continue to decrease due to asylum processing, repatriations, deportations, and US apprehensions. The majority of migrants will likely continue to wait at shelters to request asylum in Tijuana as a long-term plan and will likely not engage in aggressive behavior. There is limited to no massing potential at the POE, due to previous unsuccessful attempts; however, the JFLCC will continue to monitor any significant changes to the migrant numbers and disposition in Baja California.

CBP Field Office leadership in CA and AZ (b) (5)

(b) (5)

Interestingly, CBP has begun (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

. Due to the reduced risk, CBP is gradually reverting to normal operations as part of their (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



Gen O'Shaughnessy is scheduled to meet with the DHS Secretary and the Acting SecDef this week and we anticipate more fidelity on the way ahead.

I plan to provide my next report next week. Standing by for questions / guidance.

Semper Fidelis,

BGen Uribe

BGen Rick A. Uribe, USMC
DCG I MEF
DCG JFLCC

From: Spencer, Richard V HON SECNAV (b)(6)
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 5:10 PM
To: Bayer, Phyllis HON OASN (EI&E), ASN (EI&E) (b)(6)
Modly, Thomas HON Under Secretary of the Navy (b)(6)

intent of the meeting was to ensure all stakeholders understood the actions required to support DoD's role in constructing the wall along the Southwest border. While DoD is awaiting the official request for assistance from the Department of Homeland Security (b) (5)

DHS is expected to provide their border construction priorities to OSD by 22 Feb and OUSD (Comptroller) and DoD components are projected to identify proposed MILCON projects to source the wall construction by 4 Mar.

. Former NWIRP Bethpage, NY, Cleanup Parcel Purchased: In accordance with OASN (EI&E) staff direction given on 28 Jan, NAVFAC executed a purchase agreement for a 1.5-acre parcel for \$1.4M. (b) (5)

(b) (5). The property will be used to construct and operate a groundwater treatment facility to (b) (5)

(b) (5). (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5).

. ACHP Comments on EA-18G Growler NHPA Consultation - On 30 Nov 2018, the DON terminated consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) because, (b) (5)

(b) (5)

. Per regulation, on 19 Feb 2019 the ACHP submitted comments in response to our termination package. (b) (5)

. ATSDR List of Eight DoD Installations for PFAS Exposure Assessment: The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) plans to conduct a PFAS exposure assessment at eight communities surrounding current and former DoD installations per FY18NDAA. No Navy or Marine Corps bases are in the study, however, ATSDR will soon announce its list of communities and DASN(E) expects significant Congressional and media interest. We will work with DON, OSD, OLA and PAO regarding any inquiries. These exposure assessments will build upon the PFAS work ATSDR has previously conducted at Willow Grove, PA and West Hampton, NY.

15-60 Day Look Ahead:

22 Feb Meeting with Governor Inslee (Washington State)
24 Feb Courtesy meetings w/ Governors Roy Cooper (D-NC) and Phil Bryant (R-MS)
25 Feb EI&E Governance Board
27 Feb House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies
4 Mar Installation Innovation Conference, Miami, FL
26 Mar House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

Copy to: Under Secretary of the Navy